

Remarks

Applicant submits that the Examiner's continued rejection of claims based upon the Burge patent (6,014,638), alone or in combination with other references, is improper and must be withdrawn.

The present claims are directed to the concept of managing plural user preferences for one user, for a plurality of different, distinguishable computing environments. For example, the same user may access information from an office location (a first computing environment) and a home location (a second computing environment) and have dramatically different preferences for the presentation, style and content of information obtained in those two environments. The invention is directed to capturing these different preferences for a single user and managing them in response to changing computing environments.

The Examiner's Action summarizes the remarks made in Applicant's last response. Applicant will review each of the points below:

A. Applicant noted previously that Burge does not show one user having multiple stored profiles. In rebuttal, the Examiner cites to the user profile database discussed by Burge at col. 7, line 2. This text states that each user has a profile, and that this profile is used to decide what to present to the user when on-line. This text does not, however, state that one user has multiple stored profiles, i.e., as claims 1, 8 and 9 state it, there must be "a user" and "a plurality of usage profiles ... for the user corresponding to each of [plural] computing environments." This citation does not, therefore, support the Examiner's position.

B. Applicant noted previously that Burge does not teach a plurality of user profiles that reflect the monitored subjective profiles for a user. The Examiner has not identified any rebuttal argument.

C. Applicant noted previously that the claims relate to usage profiles stored at a server, i.e., "in the remote computing system" per claim 1, or in a "computing environment separate from the computing environment executing the program" per claims 8-9. These plural profiles are thus not in "cookies" or otherwise stored locally to the user, but in a server remote from the user. The Examiner has not identified any rebuttal argument.

D. Applicant noted previously that claim 1 recites a user at local system interacting with a remote system, and that plural profiles are stored in the remote system. Claims 8 and 9 recite a system with a memory storing plural profiles, and a remote system interacting with that system. The Examiner's reply cited Burge at col. 4, line 66 and eol. 5, line 26, which only state that there are remote and local systems, but do not state that plural profiles are in the server.

E. Applicant noted previously that the prior art does not suggest a user having plural profiles for different local computing environments. The Examiner's reply cites Burge, col. 3 lines 57-65. This text merely states that Burge's system causes interaction of multiple computers at multiple locations. It does not, however, state that there are plural profiles for a user at different local computing environments.

The Examiner also cites Burge at col. 4, lines 17-30. This text merely states that subscribers are assigned a user ID and password for accessing the service. It is never said that a

user has multiple profiles, for different computing environments. Burge simply does not teach this concept.

The Examiner's citation of Labounty (U.S. Patent 6,871,211) is directed to dependent claims that recite detecting user physiological responses. Labounty describes a medical telemetry system. Applicant submits that Labounty, if it is relevant and combinable with Burge at all, does not teach multiple profiles, for different computing environments. It thus does not support the Examiner's rejections of the independent claims 1, 8 and 9.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant again submits that all claims are patentable, and requests early transmission of a Notice of Allowability.

Applicant believes this communication is timely and that no fee is due. If however any petition for extension of time is necessary to accompany this communication, please consider this paper a petition for such an extension of time, and apply the appropriate extension of time fee to Deposit Account 23-3000. If any other charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas W. Humphrey
Reg. No. 34,353

Wood, Herron & Evans, L.L.P.
2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202-2917
Voice: (513) 241-2324
Facsimile: (513) 241-6234